

Action Item

*California Postsecondary Education Commission*

Approval of the Minutes of the April 8-9, 2002, Meeting

---



---

---

# MINUTES

## *California Postsecondary Education Commission*

### Meeting of April 8-9, 2002

---

**Commissioners  
present  
February 4-5, 2002**

Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*  
Irwin S. Field\*  
Lance Izumi  
Odessa P. Johnson  
Robert L. Moore  
Ralph Pesqueira  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.  
Evonne Seron Schulze  
Rachel E. Shetka  
Olivia K. Singh  
Howard Welinsky  
*\*April 8<sup>th</sup> only*

**Commissioner  
absent**

Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*  
William D. Campbell  
Irwin S. Field\*  
Susan Hammer  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Melinda G. Wilson  
*\*April 9<sup>th</sup> only*

---

**Call to order** Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday, April 8, 2002 California Postsecondary Education Commission meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. at California Chamber of Commerce, California Room, Esquire Plaza, 1215 K Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. He asked for a roll call.

---

**Roll call** Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Campbell, Chandler, Hammer, Jhin and Wilson. Alternate Commissioner Pesquiera was also present.

---

**Overview of the  
State budget --  
Senator Jack  
O'Connell**

Chair Arkatov introduced State Senator Jack O'Connell and Mr. Richard Rush, president of California State University Channel Islands, to provide an overview of the State Budget and to provide a progress report on the development of the Channel Islands campus.

Senator O'Connell reviewed the State Budget, noting the growing deficit. He reported that the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #1, which he chairs, would review the operational budgets of the California's higher education segments starting on May 1, 2002.

Senator O'Connell said that his two priorities for higher education were maintaining high quality and access. He cited the Commission's work in projecting Tidal Wave II,

enrollment demand growth and noted the current increase in the number of students showing up at colleges and universities statewide as evidence the Commission's projections are credible.

Senator O'Connell stated that the Legislature had enacted a bond initiative of over \$25 billion to appear before the voters during election periods over the next two years. He highlighted the number of local bond initiatives that passed in March 2002, citing the fact that voters, under the new 55-percent voter-approval requirement, had passed recently 13 of 14 community college local bonds.

---

**Status Report on  
the California  
State University,  
Channel Islands  
Campus**

Senator O'Connell introduced Richard Rush, the new President of California State University, Channel Islands who, in turn, introduced his assistant Ted Lucas. President Rush noted that in June 2001 there was one formal employee of the Channel Islands campus. Today, he said, there are 13 new faculty, five new administrators, and about 130 new staff working at the campus. He noted the exceptional qualifications of the faculty in terms of their diversity, scholarship achievements, fund raising, and public service.

President Rush then discussed the college's progress toward accreditation, noting that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) viewed the California State University Channel Islands campus accreditation proposal as a model to be used by other colleges and universities. He pointed out the campus had been successful in securing private donations.

Mr. Rush made a PowerPoint presentation that addressed several topics, including: the history of the campus; the campus's organizational structure and mission statement; eight new academic programs and thirteen new faculty; the structure of campus administration; entrepreneurial activities; relations with other schools and colleges; facilities -- current and planned; faculty and staff housing; and a new library which is to be the campus's signature building.

Commission Chairman Arkatov thanked President Rush for his overview and noted Mr. Rush's efforts in bringing the campus to fruition.

Alternate Commissioner Pesqueira lauded Mr. Rush and noted the exceptional craftsmanship of the campus facilities. Alternate Commissioner Pesqueira noted a State University Board of Trustees discussion regarding the modern appearance of the proposed library.

Commissioner Johnson also provided positive comments, stating that the college's academic programs were impressive. She asked President Rush about anticipated student enrollment over the next five years and about the availability of summer programs for high school students.

Mr. Rush responded that 1,320 students would be moved from California State University, Northridge administrative oversight to the Channel Islands campus in fall 2002. He also noted that Channel Islands has a summer program for high school students. He indicated that the campus was working with elementary school students who were planting

trees on the campus and visiting their trees each year as a way to familiarize them with a college education. He noted that the faculty also was working with students at middle schools.

Commissioner Rodriguez ask what was the process for upgrading facilities, what percentage of the campus was updated, and what obstacles the campus was facing in the process.

President Rush noted that the upgrading of facilities fell under the purview of a site authority committee, and that the committee looked at the academic needs of the campus in concert with its budget. Some obstacles include regulatory requirements such as those imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and that the college was creatively addressing those requirements to make space available.

Chair Arkatov noted the joint-use efforts of the Channel Islands campus. He asked about the use of technology on the campus.

President Rush responded that the campus was designed with several objectives in mind: students prepared to be a cognitive equal; leadership; commitment to a wireless environment, with instruction by all means; and teaching to student needs. He stated that the campus was prepared to educate students by both traditional and non-traditional methods.

Chair Arkatov concluded by thanking President Rush for his presentation.

---

**Planning update on  
the University of  
California, Merced**

Chair Arkatov called on University of California, Merced Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost David B. Ashley to provide the Commission with a planning update on this new campus.

Mr. Ashley apologized that University of California Merced Chancellor Carol Tomlinson-Keasey was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict. Mr. Ashley made a PowerPoint presentation addressing the academic planning for the University of California Merced campus. It included a discussion of developing the campus's curriculum, planning the undergraduate experience, and the library of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Mr. Ashley noted the interdisciplinary focus of the academic plan as the curriculum is being developed. He discussed Phase One of the campus layout, the institution's three academic divisions (Natural Sciences; Engineering; and Social, Humanities, and Arts), and discussed six proposed undergraduate majors and the principles for undergraduate program planning. He noted how the campus was planning for its undergraduate experience, and discussed five proposed graduate-degree programs.

Mr. Ashley highlighted that University of California Merced campus will have three educational centers in Modesto, Fresno, and Bakersfield, and would use these facilities as a means of facilitating student transfer from community colleges to the University campus. He also noted ongoing articulation discussions with various community college campuses to improve the transfer of students from throughout the Central Valley region.

Mr. Ashley continued his presentation with a discussion about the campus library for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and noted that it would provide students with access to the entire Univer-

sity of California's 30-million volume collection. He concluded his remarks by noting University of California Merced commitment to diversity.

Commissioner Schulze asked how the Legislative Analyst Office proposal to eliminate \$4.0 million dollars from the University of California Merced planning budget would affect the campus.

Mr. Ashley responded that such a reduction would be disastrous, and that the campus would be unable to hire the 15 new faculty members it hopes to next year. He stated that such a reduction would delay opening the campus.

Commissioner Schulze asked for an explanation as to why the Legislative Analyst had proposed the reduction. Mr. Ashley responded that the proposed reduction assumed that money was available to rollover from this year to hire new staff next year. However, Mr. Ashley noted, such resources are not available.

Chairman Arkatov ask Commissioner Johnson to comment on the proposed \$4.0 million reduction. Commissioner Johnson responded that the administration was trying to bring the campus to fruition, and that Regent Kolligian had pledged \$1 million toward building the campus' library. She also noted the university's efforts regarding concurrent enrollment with community colleges as one way to improve student transfer.

Commissioner Chair Arkatov asked Commissioner Johnson if the University of California Regents had approved the Long Range Development Plan for the campus. Commissioner Johnson said the Regents approved the plan in January.

Executive Director Fox asked for a copy of the Long Range Development Plan, noting that the Commission's staff would like to work with the campus as it develops its academic plan. Director Fox also said that the concurrent enrollment program was funded with private dollars and was a pilot program.

Mr. Ashley noted that this pilot program was put into place after the Regents deferred its policy on dual admissions.

Chair Arkatov asked about the status of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the environmental lawsuit. Mr. Ashley reported that the Regents approved the EIR, and that it would be another three to four months before the court would rule on the lawsuit. He noted that an adverse court ruling could delay the campus's timeline for opening.

Commissioner Arkatov asked about the use of technology for instruction at the proposed campus. Mr. Ashley responded that technology would be used to enhance program delivery, and that the options of both wireless and fiber-optic networks were being considered.

Commissioner Pesquiera asked about the vernal pool problem and whether the campus had mitigation agreements in place. Mr. Ashley said that the federal government had one-to-one mitigation requirements, and that the campus was proposing 10-to-one mitigation agreements, with 5000 acres of lands designated as a permanent reserve.

Commissioner Izumi asked about the status of proposed project labor agreements as proposed by unions. Mr. Ashley replied that no project labor agreements or discussions were taking place at this time.

Executive Director Fox noted that it is difficult to sustain innovation for a new campus, in that campuses become more traditional over time. He stated that the Commission would like to work with University to maintain innovation on the Merced campus.

Mr. Ashley welcomed the offer and noted that, since the campus would not have academic departments, but rather an interdisciplinary environment, that faculty would be more inclined to maintain innovative approaches to teaching and research.

Chair Arkatov asked about other innovative institutions throughout the nation, and what would make the University of California Merced campus unique. Mr. Ashley said that innovative institutions throughout the nation might not have tenure, not allow lecturing, and offer asynchronys learning. He noted that University of California, San Diego is perhaps one of the most innovative universities in the nation.

Commissioner Pesquiera noted the difficulty of establishing an innovative campus, such as the one at California State University, Monterey Bay. He asserted that parents expected more traditional learning programs for their children.

Mr. Ashley agreed and stated students at the University of California Merced would have both traditional and non-traditional opportunities.

Chair Arkatov thanked Mr. Ashley for his presentation.

---

**Concent calendar**

Chair Arkatov asked the Commissioners to look at the items listed in the consent calendar and asked for the Commission to move this item for consideration of the Commission as a whole.

Commissioner Johnson moved to adopt the consent calendar. Commissioner Schulze seconded and the item was approved by unanimous vote.

---

**Report of the  
Executive Director**

Commission Chair Arkatov asked Executive Director Fox to give the Director's Report.

Executive Director Fox reported that he had received a call from Commissioner Jhin who sent his best wishes and indicated that he was enjoying his new job with Peace Corps.

Director Fox provided the Commissioners with an update of the Legislature's budget committee hearings. He noted that he was successful in getting the Senate budget committee to allow the Commission to keep \$96,000 in its budget that was used for data storage at the Teale Data Center. He noted that, if the Assembly and Governor Davis agreed with the Senate's action, this amount could fund one staff position proposed for elimination. He thanked Commissioner Chandler for her assistance on the budget, and noted that Chair Arkatov will be meeting with representatives from the Department of Finance to discuss the Commission's budget.

Director Fox provided commissioners with an update on its Eligibility and Nursing Shortage studies. He noted that staff member Murray Haberman and Deputy Director David

Leveille were successful in securing \$75,000 from the University of California and from private sources to conduct the Nursing Study.

Director Fox concluded his report by noting that the Education Roundtable had prepared a letter to Senator Dede Alpert that recommended that the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Education consider instituting a community college transfer AA degree.

---

**The Commission's  
Public Agenda:  
Priorities for  
Action**

Executive Director Fox presented the Commission's *Public Agenda: Priorities for Action* report to the full Commission. He invited Deputy Director David Leveille and staff member Cheryl Hickey to join the presentation.

Ms. Hickey noted four major changes in the report since it was presented in February as an information item: (1) the baccalaureate production questions were rewritten; (2) a requirement for a review of the Bureau on Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education was added; (3) the section on the Commission website was expanded; and (4) a matrix was added for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Singh recommended putting the Commission's website address on the cover of the report.

Director Fox summarized the process for developing the *Public Agenda* and noted that it looked at the needs of California. He cited the work of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) consultants in guiding the Commission's discussions. He asked Deputy Director Leveille to discuss in greater detail the process that led up to the writing of the report.

Deputy Director Leveille noted that the objective of the *Public Agenda* was to articulate the Commission's higher education policy. The process began in March 2001 and focused on determining what was an appropriate direction for California higher education and for the Commission. He said that in preparing the *Public Agenda*, the Commission explored: (1) its role in higher education; (2) its effectiveness; (3) setting future activities; (4) setting priorities; (5) focusing on State needs; (6) emphasizing the higher education needs of all Californians; (6) goals and strategies; and (7) linkages with the Legislature, the Office of the Governor, and the various stakeholders.

Ms. Hickey then explained the four components of the report: (1) Growth and Access; (2) Preparation for Higher Education; (3) Baccalaureate Degree Production; and (4) Workforce Preparation and Economic Development.

Executive Director Fox summarized the projects of each of these four components. He noted that for Section 1 -- Growth and Access, the Commission's short-term projects would focus on student transfer, facilitating access through technology, and encouraging enrollments at independent institutions.

Commissioner Field asked for a definition of short term, mid-term and long-term projects. Director Fox said the definitions appeared at the bottom of the matrix.

The Commission engaged in a lengthy discussion about the *Public Agenda* report. Commissioner Schulze praised the quality of the document, and Commissioner Pesqueira



stated that the Commission should make certain that it had adequate resources to do its work plan. Commissioner Pesqueira said the Legislature often created obstacles to student access. He cited the value of a higher education and said the Commission should address the student-fee issue. He stated that funding for undergraduate and graduate education should be mentioned.

Commissioner Moore stated that one element missing from the report was elevating the Commission's visibility. He also suggested that the Commission should be interfacing with groups outside the education community. Executive Director Fox stated that the *Public Agenda* focused on the Commission's work products; however, he stated that he would make a concerted effort to add language early in the report on the Commission's interest in becoming more visible.

Commissioner Moore stated that the Commission should work closer with other researchers and research centers to leverage its work.

Chair Arkatov noted that it is important to focus on what the Commission can get done, and how it can best influence policy. He also stated that the *Public Agenda* is an evolving document.

Commissioner Moore asked Executive Director Fox to share with the Commission at its next meeting an update on the *Public Agenda*. He suggested that an item be placed on each Commission meeting agenda for discussing pertinent higher education issues with other groups.

Commission Chair Arkatov stated that the Commission needs a covenant with each of the higher education segments. He noted that the Commission receives 1/60 of 1% of the dollars expended for higher education. He suggested that Commission activities should be imbedded in its discussions, and that there was a need for more discussion on the issue of regionalism.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated the *Public Agenda* was a good blueprint. He asked Executive Director Fox how the plan helps the Commission reach its goals. Commissioner Pesqueira continued the discussion by stating that it is critical that the Commission make an effort to blunt legislative proposals that might be harmful to higher education. He said that the Legislature needs to understand the policy implications of legislation, and that the Commission must comment on those implications.

Commissioner Field stated that policy should be made based on data. He then noted that the Commission's work plan should identify how it will collaborate with the education community, and stated that there was a need for better collaboration.

Commission Rodriguez said that the Commission should determine what it does well. He noted that the Commission is good at information dissemination, but that the Commission should progress from data dissemination to policy activism. He noted the Commission's limited resources, and that it was important to identify priorities. He applauded the Commission's work on the higher education bond initiative and on joint-use facilities as successful endeavors, and suggested that the Commission should be selective in those issues it would like to address.

Chairman Arkatov stated that the implementation of the *Public Agenda* was important. Commissioner Moore stated that the Commission should have an implementation discussion as part of its meeting agenda, and that the dialog should take place with the Commission partners at each meeting.

Commissioner Rodriguez noted that many of the Commission's partners use its data.

Commissioner Schulze stated that she would like more open-ended discussions on policy issues. She indicated that she would like Executive Director Fox to make recommendations to the Commission regarding what partners the Commission should identify to accomplish its goals. Executive Director Fox noted that there was a distinction between the *Public Agenda* and its regular meeting agenda. He indicated that he would seek ways to incorporate the *Public Agenda* into the meeting agenda.

Commissioner Schulze suggested that the Commission use its committee structure to have more substantive discussions in a more informal setting. Commissioner Rodriguez noted that some Commissioners are more involved in meetings than others.

Commissioner Welinsky discussed the structure of the Commission and its committees. He stated that the size of the agenda is overwhelming and that the agendas were difficult to digest. He suggested that the Commission needed a separate committee to deal with implementation issues.

Chair Arkatov stated it was important to separate the *Public Agenda* from an implementation plan. He encouraged his fellow Commissioners to embrace the *Public Agenda* report.

Executive Director Fox suggested that there was consensus among the Commissioners to include an item on their meeting agenda on networking and advancing the Commission's role. He said a separate discussion needed to take place on how to structure dialog and how items should be presented. This, Mr. Fox indicated, would be a discussion he would have with the Executive Committee. He noted that he would move Commissioner Moore's ideas forward.

Mr. Fox identified other short-term projects that the Commission would accomplish during the next year. With respect to Section 2 of the *Public Agenda* – Preparation for Postsecondary Education, Mr. Fox noted the Commission's Eligibility and Outreach studies were short-term projects.

With respect to Section 3 – Baccalaureate Degree Production – Ms. Hickey noted three short-term projects: degree production in other states; degree production by racial ethnic groups, gender, and discipline; and degree production by discipline and employment by industry cluster.

Deputy Director Leveille then discussed short-term projects in Section 4 of the *Public Agenda*, including a study for the Legislature that would review the Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education.

Executive Director Fox concluded with a brief discussion about the Commission's recurring responsibilities and directed the Commission's attention to Section 5 of the re-

port. He stated that the final version of the report would incorporate the comments and suggestions made by commissioners during their discussion. He also stated that the Commission would have a separate discussion regarding its meeting agenda.

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Moore moved adoption of the item with the incorporation of additional language. Commissioner Schulze seconded the motion, and the item was unanimously approved.

---

**Report of the  
Statutory Advisory  
Committee**

Statutory Advisory Committee Chairman Todd Greenspan from the University of California said that the Statutory Committee had reviewed the Commission's agenda. He suggested that a potential item for Commission discussion was a report recently published by the Council on Science and Technology, and that the Commission might want to partner with the Council on issues of mutual interest. He highlighted segmental concern about the removal of financial aid from their budgets, and giving those resources to the Student Aid Commission. He noted that the Committee discussed new board and administrative appointments to each respective segment.

Mr. Greenspan also advised the Commission that April was Community College Month. He updated members regarding the status of University of California and the SAT admission tests, transfer issues between community colleges and independent institutions, and a new student produced website on colleges and universities that was being underwritten by the California Department of Education. He concluded his presentation with a brief discussion about Senator Alarcon's proposed legislation on requiring each student to receive the "a-g" university-preparation coursework unless a student opts out. He noted that the Commission would discuss this legislation at its meeting the next day.

Commissioner Schulze asked how many vacant positions existed on each segment's governing boards.

Mr. Greenspan responded that he was only reporting on recent appointments and didn't know about the number of current vacancies.

Chairman Arkatov asked Mr. Greenspan to report to the Commission at its next meeting about the higher education bond measure, and how the segments were going to coordinate their efforts in assuring the bond's passage.

---

**Recess**

Chair Arkatov recessed the California Postsecondary Education Commission meeting at 5:00 p.m. until the following morning.

---

**Call to order**

Commission Chair Arkatov called the Tuesday, April 9, 2002, meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 8:45 a.m. He asked for a call of the roll.

---

**Call of the roll**

Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Commissioners Campbell, Chandler, Field, Hammer, Jhin and Wilson. Alternate Commissioner Ralph Pesqueira was also present.

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the Commission meeting at 8:50 a.m. in order for the Governmental Relations Committee to meet.
<b>Reconvene</b>	Commission Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 12:00 p.m., and called on Commissioner Schulze, Welinsky, and Singh to report on the business of the respective committees each chairs.
<b>Report of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee</b>	Committee Chair Schulze reported that the Educational Policy and Programs Committee had met to discuss Item 10 – <i>Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Joint-Use Facilities</i> . She moved adoption of the report, which was seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The Commission unanimously approved adoption of the report for transmittal to the Office of the Governor and Legislature.
<b>Report of the Governmental Relations Committee</b>	Committee Chair Welinsky reported that the Governmental Relations Committee had met to discuss Item 7 – <i>Legislative Update, April 2002</i> . He moved adoption of the report, which seconded by Commissioner Schulze. The Commission unanimously approved adoption of the report.
<b>Report of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee</b>	Committee Chair Singh reported that the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee had met to discuss Item 5 – <i>Faculty Salaries in California Public Universities, 2002-03</i> . She moved adoption of the report, which was seconded by Commissioner Moore. The Commission unanimously approved adoption of the report for transmittal to the Governor and Legislature.
<b>Adjournment</b>	Having no further business, Commission Chair Arkatov adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.